



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,897	12/23/2003	Louis Gregory Alster	08350.2652	7089

22852 7590 06/29/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
 LLP  
 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

PHAN, HAU VAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3618

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/742,897	Applicant(s) ALSTER ET AL.	
	Examiner Hau V Phan	Art Unit 3618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2005.  
 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-18 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-18 and 20-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Acknowledgment*

1. The amendment filed on 5/17/2005 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-3, 5-18, 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. (5,350,031) in view of Moore (6,306,056).**

Sugiyama et al. in figure 1, disclose a plural generator apparatus for an electric hybrid vehicle comprising an engine (1), a first electric generator (21), a second electric generator (22), an energy storage device (5) adapted to receive the first output from the first electric generator and the second output from the second electric generator and an electric motor (7) operatively connected to the energy storage device. The electric motor is operable to generate mechanical power. Sugiyama et al. fail to show a second engine.

Moore in figure 1, teaches a dual engine hybrid electric vehicle comprising a first engine (12) and a second engine (18). The first engine has operational characteristics within a first range of rotations per minute and the second engine has operational

Art Unit: 3618

characteristics within a second range of rotations per minute. Wherein the first range of rotations per minute is greater than the second range of rotations per minute. The first engine is running during the normal operation (rpm 1) and the second engine provides additional driving torque requirement to the vehicle (rpm2). Therefore, the first engine should have the rotation per minute greater than the rotation per minute than the second engine. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electric hybrid vehicle of Sugiyama et al. with the addition of a second engine as taught by Moore in order to assist the first engine in providing torque to the driving wheel of the vehicle.

Regarding claim 2, Sugiyama et al. disclose the energy storage device that is a battery.

Regarding claims 3 and 18, Moore discloses the first and second engines having a substantially similar torque output capacity.

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Moore discloses the first engine having preferred operational characteristics within a first torque range and the second engine has preferred operational characteristics within a second torque range, and wherein the first torque range is greater than the second torque range.

Regarding claims 6 and 21, Sugiyama et al. disclose the first output of the first generator, which is greater than the second output of the second generator.

Regarding claims 7 and 22, Moore discloses a heat exchanger operatively connected with the first engine and the second engine (col. 3, lines 28-36).

Regarding claims 8 and 23, Moore discloses a transmission axle adapted to be driven by the electric motor (figure 2).

Regarding claims 9 and 24, Moore discloses a controller (as shown in figure 6) operatively connected with the first engine and the second engine. The controller adjusts the operation of the first engine and the second engine based on current operating conditions.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's remark on page 12, neither Sugiyama or Moore alone or in combination disclose an electric drive including all the features of claim 1, with "a first engine having operational characteristic within a first range of rotation per minute" and "a second engine having operational characteristics within a second range of rotation per minute and wherein the first range of rotation per minute is greater than the second range of rotations per minute". The examiner disagrees, because the first engine is running during the normal operation (rpm 1) and the second engine provides additional driving torque requirement to the vehicle (rpm2). Therefore, the first engine should have the rotation per minute greater than the rotation per minute than the second engine when the second engine is just start up to provide addition torque to the vehicle.

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hau V Phan whose telephone number is 703-308-2084. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christ Ellis can be reached on 703-308-2560. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hau V Phan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3618

*Hau Phan*  
*6/24/05*